THEOLOGY

VOL. LXIII JANUARY, 1960 No. 475

Editorial

DURING the course of this year we shall be publishing some articles which will be in the nature of surveys of developments in various fields of theology during the past twenty-one years or so. Old readers of THEOLOGY may remember that we published a similar series of articles in 1939. Since then, Christian thinkers have not lapsed into idleness, as the endless stream of books that flows into our office for review bears testimony. We seek to provide assessments of as many of them as possible, but amid their abundance and the many different things they say it is not easy to be sure how far new trends are making themselves felt or old ground is being traversed once again. From time to time a stock-taking by those who are closely abreast of particular branches of study helps the rest of us to get an idea of what is happening and of what to look out for in our reading. The first of these articles, which will appear at intervals, is contributed this month by Dr Mascall, and needs no further introduction.

* * * * *

Autres temps autres mœurs. "CLERICAL MAGISTRATES. A return to the House of Commons has been published, of the names, addresses and residences of justices of the peace, being ministers of the Established Church, which makes the total number above 2,000. In Norfolk there are 102 reverend justices of the peace, and in Suffolk not less than 111. These counties are the best conducted in England." —*The Church Magazine,* September 1840, p. 287.

Anglican Dogmatic Theology, 1939-60

A SURVEY AND A RETROSPECT

ONE of the main characteristics of Anglican theology in general has been a marked reluctance to draw a sharp line of demarcation between dogmatic theology as such and other branches of theological learning. The common Anglican appeal to the threefold authority of Scripture, reason and history inevitably produces a certain vagueness of outline, and it must also be recognized that the few Anglican writers who have addressed themselves explicitly to systematic dogmatic theology have produced treatises which, while undeniably learned and useful, have for the most part been somewhat remote and dull. Whether the paucity of both theologians and theological works devoted *ex professo* to dogmatic theology has been on the whole a source of strength or of weakness to the Anglican Communion can no doubt be debated. At its worst it can mean that

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

dogmatic judgment upon certain vital theological issues is almost non-existent; at best it can mean that the peculiar insight and approach of the dogmatic theologian permeates regions in which, in other branches of Christendom, it is hardly at all to be found. It certainly means that a survey such as I am now undertaking at the invitation of the editor of THEOLOGY is bound to trespass into the domains of other contributors to the series.

It would, I think, be as true as any general statement can be, to say that the main characteristic of Anglican theology since 1939 has been a steady revival of concern with Christian doctrine as such which has permeated all regions of theological study and exposition. Predominantly in the nineteen-twenties and to a diminishing extent until the outbreak of the Second World War the main occupation of Anglican theologians had been, in the wide sense of the word, apologetic. It was generally supposed that the discoveries of scientists, historians and literary scholars had rendered it extremely difficult for contemporary men and women to accept the Christian faith and live the life of the Christian Church, and the preoccupation of theologians with apologetics was the natural and praiseworthy manifestation of the Church's evangelistic task on the intellectual level. Such a work as *Essays Catholic and Critical* was a typical product of it. The movement had, however, its weaknesses. It was, on the whole, too ready to accept the contemporary deliverances of the secular sciences as reliable and ultimate; as a result of its natural tendency to show how little a man needed to believe in order to be justified in practising the Christian religion, it tended to a dogmatically attenuated type of religion which was somewhat lacking in appeal to those who were not professional or amateur intellectuals; and, as the members of the "Christendom Group" more than once pointed out, because of its anxiety to make Christianity acceptable to the modern mind, it was singularly impotent in bringing a Christian judgment to bear upon the modern mind's prejudices and assumptions in both the intellectual and the social realm. Well before the Second World War the rumblings of revolt against liberalism in theology had been heard in the biblical revival in continental Protestantism. Karl Barth's commentary on the Epistle to the Romans had been published in German as long ago as 1919; but it was not until Edwyn Hoskyns launched it upon a bewildered and startled English public in 1932 that the biblical revival was widely heard of in these islands. Since that date numerous works by German, Swiss, Scandinavian, French and even British scholars have demonstrated its vigour and its relevance to the life of the Church and the concerns of the day.

The specifically biblical aspect of this movement must be left to other contributors to this series, but something must be said about its doctrinal implications. It has emphasized biblical exegesis and the doctrinal content of the Bible much more than critical and historical research, although in its more recent phases the latter has been pressed into the service of the former in a way that has often been extremely illuminating. Its fundamental conviction has been

that the Bible is the Word of God, uttered for man's salvation, rather than a collection of documents thrown off by the human race in the course of its religious development. However, arising as it did in the setting of German-speaking Protestantism, it has, especially in the writings of its progenitor Karl Barth, frequently exhibited a tone of stridency and a hysterical antagonism to the human reason which its more moderate exponents have found it difficult to stem. In consequence the movement was met by many of the older biblical scholars with a mixture of misunderstanding and contempt. It has been perhaps the most important contribution of Anglican theologians to the movement to discriminate between two distinct elements in it, and to show that it is perfectly possible to engage in a serious theological study of the Bible without holding a Lutheran view of the corruption of the human reason or of the religious irrelevance of the secular realm. It is at this point that the Anglican dogmatic theologian can make, and indeed has made, his most valuable contribution.

The biblical revival came to birth almost entirely in the setting of continental Protestantism, though it has, of course, been taken up enthusiastically by a number of Roman Catholic theologians, especially in France; and indeed the school of Père Lagrange, in spite of the restrictions under which he and his disciples laboured, may even be looked upon as one of its begetters. There is, however, another great movement in Christendom which has arisen in the heart of Catholicism, though it has more recently shown some lively manifestations in the Protestant churches. This is the Liturgical Revival and, like the Biblical Revival, it has derived its main dynamic from the pastoral concern of the Church rather than from the labours of the study. In this, no less than in the Biblical Revival, Anglican dogmatic theologians have played an active part, a part which is all the more necessary since it is even easier for liturgical than for biblical expression in the life of the Church to become eccentric and even pernicious if it escapes the control of a sound theology. There are two main lines along which the theologian's contribution can be made. First, he can, by a theological investigation of the history of Christian liturgy, do a great work in guiding the whole movement of liturgical revision, both the official revision which is at present being undertaken in almost every part of the Anglican Communion and the unofficial revision which, often unconsciously, is going on continuously in every parish church and every chapel. This is largely a task for the liturgiologist as such, but if it is to avoid mere antiquarianism and faddishness it needs steady theological insight. If the liturgiologist is also a theologian, so much the better; if not, he needs the sympathetic and understanding collaboration of the liturgical theologian, that is to say the dogmatic theologian who is specially interested in the theological implications of the historic rites and ceremonies of the Christian Church. There is, however, another and even more important task for the dogmatic theologian in the liturgical realm, namely the study of the nature of the sacramental activity of the Church in its inner nature as distinct from the forms in which it has historically clothed itself; in this aspect, he might be called

336369

the sacramental theologian rather than the liturgical theologian. I wish as far as possible to avoid in the course of this article reference to theologians by name, for any adequate reference would need more space than is available and selection is invidious; I cannot, however, avoid mentioning the great name of that brilliant liturgical scholar who was prematurely taken from us a few years ago, Dom Gregory Dix, to whom more than to anyone else is due the revival of liturgical interest as a living thing in the Anglican Communion. No doubt he sometimes made mistakes, as other scholars do, but the fact is undeniable that his fascinating and exciting book *The Shape of the Liturgy* transformed Anglican liturgiology almost overnight from the most remote and academic branch of scholarship into a study whose immediate relevance became evident to multitudes of parish priests. This was precisely because he was not only a liturgical scholar but also a sacramental theologian; because he was not only interested in the way people had done things in church but also in the inner nature of the thing that they were doing there. The close collaboration that now exists between theologians and liturgists in the Anglican Church is largely Dix's legacy. And because this liturgical interest is theological it links up with almost every branch of dogmatic theology.

If one was to characterize briefly the general scope of Anglican dogmatic theology as it has developed in the last twenty years and as it is to-day, it might perhaps be best summed up in the phrase "the Body of Christ", and as so summed up it will be seen as implying a unity and a coherence that Western dogmatic theology, both Catholic and Protestant, has commonly lacked, and for lack of which it has tended to fall into a number of more or less isolated tractates. If, however, the phrase in question *is* taken seriously—and this is happening not only in the Anglican Communion but in Rome and in Protestantism too—it has a unifying and constructive power whose ramifications are almost inexhaustible. That the Second Person of the Holy and Ever-blessed Trinity united manhood to himself in the womb of the Virgin of Nazareth is the basis of the doctrine of the Incarnation; that that manhood is still united to his divine Person and that we are incorporated into it in the sacrament of Baptism is the basis of the doctrine of the Church and of the sacraments in general; that that manhood is sacramentally communicated to the Church under the forms of bread and wine is the basis of the doctrine of the Eucharist. Together with this new understanding there has gone a re-examination of the conception of sacrifice which has done a great deal to draw together Anglican theologians of the Catholic and Evangelical schools. When one thinks of the conflicts which have rent Western Christendom in the last four hundred years on the subject of the Eucharistic sacrifice, it is indeed remarkable that at the present day a deeper understanding than the sixteenth century possessed of the nature of sacrifice itself has brought Catholics and Protestants within measurable distance of agreement on the matter. Perhaps the next step will do for the Eucharistic presence what has already been done for the Eucharistic sacrifice.

It must not be supposed, however, that there are no outstanding dogmatic issues of consequence in Anglicanism to-day. The theological status of confirmation and its relation to baptism are matters of both practical urgency and theological dispute. Two questions are involved, which have too often been confused, namely whether baptism apart from confirmation confers full membership of the Church and whether the Holy Spirit is given in baptism or only in confirmation. Again, there are a host of questions concerning the nature of the Church's ministry and of the Church's structure as a whole, the discussion of which is not rendered easier by the fact that they are tied up with practical proposals in the realm of Christian reunion which arouse strong emotional reactions of many different kinds. In all these Anglican dogmatic theologians are involved, and they are as yet far from complete agreement; nevertheless, it seems true to say that these questions are to-day being discussed on a more fundamental theological level than was the case in the past.

I am inclined myself to think—though this is only a personal view—that some of these problems in the theology of the Church and the sacraments, which trouble not only Anglicans but other Christians as well—are unlikely to be solved until we get behind them to a fuller discussion of the nature of creation itself and of God's relation to the finite world. The fundamental theological difference between Catholicism and Protestantism would seem to be concerned with the relation between the primary creative causality of God and the secondary causality of his creatures, two activities which Catholicism has tried to hold together in a unity even at the danger of attributing too much to the creature, while Protestantism has tended to separate them to the point of either denying the reality of the created activity altogether or else (in the later "liberal" phase) of denying its genuine dependence upon God. This is not the place to attempt to solve this problem, but it does look as if, as regards alike grace, the Incarnation, the Church, the sacraments and the ministry, it is here that the real divergence lies, and Anglican dogmatic theologians may in the near future have much to do in this field.

Of almost equal importance with the Biblical and Liturgical Revivals since the Second World War has been the astounding resurgence of interest in patristics, a concrete example of which has been the assembling of nearly six hundred scholars at Oxford in September 1959 for the Third International Conference on Patristic Studies. This movement has been predominantly notable in the Roman Church, where it has provided scholars with an unimpeachable refuge from the somewhat rigid positions of post-medieval scholasticism, but it is undoubtedly an authentic manifestation of the recovery throughout Christendom of the sense that the true principles for the solutions of our present problems are to be found in the undivided Church. Like other movements this can become archaistic and pedantic, but it is significant that it has in fact close links with the most realistic and practical movements in Christendom to-day. Anglicanism has traditionally appealed to the ancient fathers as the authentic interpreters of Scripture and, after a period of neglect, there are signs

of a new patristic interest in Anglicanism which will have close links with liturgical theology and ecclesiology; if anyone can be named as specially influential in its resurgence it must be that recently lamented scholar G. L. Prestige.

In the years immediately before the Second World War one of the most lively expressions of Anglican dogmatic theology was in the sphere of sociology, especially within the group of, for the most part, young theologians and parish priests who were associated with the journal *Christendom*. It cannot be claimed that this particular dogmatic manifestation has been nearly so prominent since the war. Partly this would seem to be the result of a social situation in which the sociological implications of Christian doctrine are much less immediately obvious; partly it may be that many of those who were then involved have been drawn into other theological tasks; but at least part of the explanation would seem to be that, as one might expect from the developments that I have outlined in previous paragraphs, the social implications of Christian doctrine have been seen as located much more in the life of the Church itself than was previously recognized. The dangers of escapism in this are obvious and they have not been altogether avoided. Perhaps the most urgent task in this sphere for Anglicans is a theological assessment of the contemporary world and national situations and an attempt to find the points at which, not merely Christian theology, but the Christian Church as the Body of Christ is to make its impact on them.

Finally, something must be said about the theological contacts of Anglicanism with Eastern Orthodoxy. On the level of ecclesiastical politics contacts between the two communions have, through the very nature of the world situation, been much fewer and more restrained than they were between the two wars. Nevertheless, on the theological level and in a comparatively unobtrusive way, some of the contacts have been extremely stimulating. In contrast to the more official discussions, which have always been concerned primarily with the overt pretexts for disunity—the *filioque*, the number of the Councils and of the sacraments, and so on—there have been a number of discussions of more basic questions which have thrown much light upon the theological nature of our divisions and have also been extremely fruitful in themselves. On the Orthodox side the most significant figure was that of Vladimir Lossky, whose important book *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* was published in English in 1957, shortly before his unexpected death. What has emerged from these discussions is that Eastern and Western Christendom have widely different approaches to the doctrine of God and of creation, and that this difference underlies all the other points at issue. The centrality which Eastern Orthodoxy gives to the trinitarian reality of God would seem to open up one of the most promising lines of thought for ecumenical discussion; Anglican theologians would do well to apply themselves to this task.

As one looks back over the last twenty-one years at the general movement of Anglican dogmatic theology, there is much to record with gratitude. After a period of considerable though understandable

neglect, there has been a definite recovery of the sense of the importance of systematic dogmatic thought. On the other hand, there is certainly no ground for complacency. Our dogmatic theologians are comparatively few in number, and circumstances have compelled them to spend much of their time and effort in controversy with non-Anglicans and with one another. The situation is one of opportunity rather than of achievement, and the opportunity is largely unrecognized. On the other hand, I am convinced that the opportunity is there for us to take it. How we are to do that, however, is not the subject of this article.

E. L. Mascall.

The Ordinal of the Church of South India

The Church of South India is in process of producing its equivalent of the Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*. The Eucharistic Liturgy, or Order of *The Lord's Supper*, is already well known. *The Ordinal*, containing the *Orders for The Ordination of Deacons, The Ordination of Presbyters, The Consecration of Bishops*[1] was authorized by the Synod in January 1958.

The Orders are introduced by a preface consisting of a statement of "General Principles", and of such importance that passages from it must be quoted verbatim. The General Principles are three in number. The first concerns the Church and the Ministry, and the relation between them. The Church "as a whole" is described as "a priestly body, since it is the body of Christ the great High Priest". All its members, therefore, "according to the measure of the gift of Christ, share in its priestly nature". The Ministry, on the other hand, is not a mere delegacy of the body. It "is a gift of God through Christ to his Church, which he has given for the perfecting of the life and service of all its members". Further, "from the beginning God has entrusted particular ministries to particular persons within it (i.e. the Church), and these have, through the Church, received the commission of Christ". In the Church of South India the Ministry is constituted of bishops, presbyters and deacons. It is not a new ministry, however, bearing traditional nomenclature, yet specially created to suit the circumstances of a Church formed by a union of several, previously distinct religious bodies. The historic terms used to designate the three ministries mean what they appear to mean. "In accepting this ministry the Church of South India desires to maintain continuity with the historic ministry of the Church as it has come down to us from early times through the uniting Churches." Readers both of the preface and the rites will not fail to notice that the term "orders" is nowhere applied to the Ministry. The omission is to be explained by the absence of the term, as an appellation of ministries, from the New Testament documents. Nevertheless, although the term is avoided, the fact of the historic "orders" or "grades" of ministry is

[1] *The Church of South India. The Ordinal*. Oxford University Press. 1s.

recognized in *The Ordinal*. It is apparent in the differentiation of ministerial functions, and in the inter-relationship subsisting between the ministries. Both differentiation and inter-relationship are of the historic kind; and in the case of each of the three ministries the functions are the historic functions. Also, progression from the diaconate to the larger ministry of the presbyterate, and from the presbyterate to the wider ministry of the episcopate is effected only by the historic liturgical act of ordination or consecration. In the presence of such fact or facts, the avoidance of the traditional designation of the ministries is of no consequence.

The second principle is concerned with the question, Who ordains? The average Anglican, and others in the medieval tradition, would answer, no doubt, that the ordainer is the bishop. The Church of South India, on the other hand, states its belief that "in all ordinations and consecrations the true Ordainer and Consecrator is God who, in response to the prayers of his Church, and through the words and acts of its representatives, commissions and empowers for the office and work to which they are called the persons whom it has selected". For this reason, an ordination is described as "an act of God in his Church". The presiding bishop, therefore, serves on one side as the agent of God, and on the other as representative of the Church. Here, whether consciously or otherwise, the South Indian Church authorities have adopted the ancient and, it may be added, the obviously right conception of the matter. This conception remains unobscured in the ordination rites of the Greek Orthodox and other Eastern Churches. Had it not been obscured in the West, and ordination interpreted as a personal act of the bishop conferring certain powers upon the ordinands, not a little controversy, error and division could have been prevented.

The third principle is a statement of the essential pattern and constituent elements of an ordination rite, and is founded upon the appointment of the seven deacons, narrated in Acts 6. 1–6. In that narrative, "the following parts appear: election, prayer, and the laying on of apostolic hands", so providing what the Church of South India takes to be "scriptural authority" for the pattern of its ordination procedure. "The same three parts form the basis of the services" in *The Ordinal*, and are liturgically presented thus: "(1) The presentation of the candidates to the presiding Bishop, this being the last step in the process of choice of them by the Church; (2) prayer for those about to be ordained or consecrated, that they may receive the gift of the Holy Spirit for their ministry; and (3) the laying on of hands of at least three Bishops (in an episcopal consecration), of the Bishop and Presbyters (in an ordination of Presbyters), or of the Bishop (in an ordination of Deacons)." The details of the pattern, it will be observed, correspond with the ordination usage of the ancient Church. If (2) had been worded "prayer for those being ordained or consecrated", etc., it would have conformed more closely with the tenor of the services themselves, because, in each of them, the prayer for the gift of the Spirit, accompanied by the laying on of hands, clearly constitutes the essential act, without which the ordination or

consecration would be incomplete, and to which all that precedes looks forward. The ceremonies immediately succeeding the prayer, viz. the delivery of instruments of office and the giving of the right hand of fellowship, are not counted as necessary components of the act of ordination. The preface properly describes them as "valuable for their symbolism, . . . not essential elements in the rites of ordination"; and the formulae which accompany the ceremonies assume ordination or consecration to have been already accomplished.

One matter, however, and that of some importance, is not noticed in the preface. It arises out of a direction governing the laying on of hands at the consecration of a bishop. The direction runs, "Here the Moderator and the Bishops (and Presbyters) lay their hands on the head of the Bishop-elect".[1] The presbyters here mentioned are not explicitly designated. They may be either all those present, or only the two who, belonging to the diocese of the bishop-elect, have assigned to them, by a previous direction,[2] the duty of presenting him to the Moderator for consecration. Neither the association of presbyters with the bishops at a consecration nor the brackets which enclose the mention of the presbyters are explained in *The Ordinal*. It is possible that, on account of this direction, some Anglicans will be disposed to disapprove the South Indian consecration rite. Admittedly, there is no sure and safe precedent or authority for the practice which the direction enjoins;[3] indeed, in the earliest extant consecration rite, the "presbytery" is directed to "stand by" silently, while the bishops alone lay their hands upon the bishop-elect.[4] Nevertheless, critics would be wise to refrain from classifying the South Indian practice as so damaging a breach with historic usage that, by historic standards, it must be held to nullify the act of consecration. To maintain this opinion is to ignore the major facts presented in *The Ordinal*. The Church of South India, in plain and unequivocal terms, has made its own the ancient and universal rule

[1] *Ordinal*, p. 18.

[2] *Ordinal*, p. 14.

[3] 1 Tim. 4. 14 is commonly adduced as evidence for presbyters having a part in the ordination of a bishop in New Testament times; but, as Prof. Daube has pointed out recently, this interpretation is difficult to reconcile with the terms of 1 Tim. 5. 22 and 2 Tim. 1. 6, which apparently exclude the presbytery. Prof. Daube proposes a different interpretation: "the phrase *ἐπίθεσις τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου* looks like a rendering of the technical term *semikath zeqenim*, literally 'the leaning on of elders' . . . or briefly, 'Rabbinic ordination'. . . . On this basis we ought to translate, 'Neglect not the gift which was given thee by prophecy, with *semikath zeqenim*, due ordination, ordination conferring full authority'" (D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, 1956, pp. 244 f.). No. 2 of the so-called *Canons of Hippolytus*, which directs, "One of the bishops and presbyters shall be chosen to lay the hand on his head and to pray", is also cited to show that, at some time and in some church, presbyters and bishops co-operated in consecrating bishops-elect. These Canons, however, survive only in an Arabic version, which is at several removes from the lost original Greek. The Arabic of Canon 2 lacks clarity. Until the authentic text is recovered, the terms of the Canon must remain in doubt (for a German translation see W. Riedel, *Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien*, 1900, p. 201).

[4] See G. Dix, *The Apostolic Tradition of St Hippolytus*, 1937, p. 3.

requiring at least three bishops to lay hands upon a bishop-elect at his consecration. The practice involves no departure from that rule. If *The Ordinal* admits the co-operation of presbyters, it nowhere provides that they may take the place of the bishops assisting the Moderator, and neither directly, nor indirectly, does it assign to presbyters the functions of consecrating or ordaining. Again, the absence of allusion to presbyters in the statement concerning the requisites for an episcopal consecration made in (3) quoted above leads to the inference that the presbyteral hand-laying is not accounted necessary for a consecration, and is consequently not to be understood as possessing the same significance as the hand-laying of the bishops. The use of the brackets in the liturgical direction appears to support the inference. What significance, then, could the practice be said to possess? In want of a statement to the contrary it could be held to denote what Bishop John Wordsworth, of Salisbury, termed "the essential unity of character" existing between the episcopal and presbyteral ministries,[1] or (to borrow a recent phrase of Dom B. Botte) "le caractère collégial de l'épiscopat et de la prêtrise".[2] If that interpretation were acceptable, the co-operation of presbyters at a consecration would be reckoned as, in Western terminology, a "ceremonial concelebration", not substantially different from their co-operation with the bishop at the ordination of a presbyter. It would consequently rank as an accessory, that is, as one of those ceremonies which, while they are (in the already quoted words of the preface) "valuable for their symbolism, are not essentials" of the rite.

The rites themselves must now be briefly considered. They have the advantage of being comprehensible by the simplest layman at a glance. Their structure is uniform; each part of it is indicated by a sub-title printed in capitals; and all three rites are intercalated into the Eucharistic Liturgy at the same points. THE PRESENTATION is inserted between the Preparation for the Eucharist and the proper Collect, which is the same for each rite. THE EXAMINATION, which immediately precedes the actual ORDINATION or CONSECRATION, follows the Nicene Creed. The delivery of the instruments of office is appended to the Ordination or Consecration. The Eucharistic Liturgy is resumed at the Litany, which contains special petitions for the newly ordained and for "their wives and homes". When an ordination of deacons and presbyters occurs at the same time, the traditional sequence is observed; the presbyters are ordained after the deacons. A note recommends, however, that deacons and presbyters should "ordinarily" be ordained "at separate services".

The PRESENTATION is more extended than its equivalent in the English Ordinal. The authorization of their diocese for ordaining the candidates, together with particulars of the work to which each of them is called, is read. When the bishop has summoned any person

[1] *The Ministry of Grace*, 2nd edn revised, 1903, p. 142.

[2] See Dom Botte's contribution, under this title, to *Études sur le Sacrement de l'Ordre*, Lex Orandi 22, Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1957, pp. 97–124; note especially the writer's "Conclusions".

knowing a reason why any candidate ought not to be ordained to come forth and declare it, he puts the positive question, "Do you trust that these persons are, by God's grace, worthy to be ordained?" The people answer, "We trust that they are worthy. To God be the glory." Mutatis mutandis, the same procedure and forms serve at a consecration.

The series of questions which constitute the three forms of EXAMINATION in general cover the same ground as the English series, but sometimes go beyond it. The questions addressed to the presbyter candidates are immediately introduced by the words, "We act and speak as part of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, and in the faith which we have now with united voice declared in the words of the Creed.[1] Wherefore, that we may know that you truly profess this faith, and desire to fulfil this ministry, we require you to answer these questions." The first question expresses the universal character of the ministry, "Do you trust that you are truly called by God to this ministry in his Church?" The same question is addressed to deacon candidates. For bishops-elect it is phrased, "Do you trust that you are called to the office of Bishop in the Church of God?" The last question, in each case, relates the universal ministry to the local context. Deacon and presbyter candidates are asked, "Seeing you believe you are called to exercise this ministry within the Church of South India, will you accept its discipline and submit yourselves as sons in the Gospel to those whom this Church shall appoint over you?" Bishops-elect are asked, "Seeing . . . Church of South India, do you promise to fulfil the duties of your office in accordance with the constitution of this Church and of the diocese to which you are appointed?" One question is common to the three series, "Do you accept the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as witnessing to the faith that is set forth in Scripture?" Two questions, particular to bishops-elect, are of interest. One, which has no counterpart in the English series, recalls a primary function of the early episcopate, "Will you do all in your power to ensure that the worship offered by the ministers and people committed to your charge shall be worthy of God's majesty and love?" The other inquires, "Will you see that Baptism and Confirmation are duly and regularly administered in your diocese, and will you be faithful and discreet in ordaining men to the sacred ministry?"

The rites attain their culmination respectively in THE ORDINATION and THE CONSECRATION. These consist in a single solemn Prayer, with a common main petition, for each ministry. The bishop (or the Moderator) first calls the people to silent prayer; and the hymn, "Come, Holy Ghost" (or a vernacular equivalent in an Indian metre and set to an Indian tune), is sung by all kneeling. The solemn Prayer is then said by the bishop (or by the Moderator) alone, both he and associated presbyters and assisting bishops standing. Although the Prayer is not cast in the form of a Western euchar-

[1] The adjective, "Holy", has been restored to the description of the Church in the South Indian version of the "Nicene" Creed.

istic preface,[1] its initial phrases strike the note of praise and thanksgiving: "We glorify thee . . . we thank thee . . ." The exordium of the Deacons' Prayer recalls the Lord, in his aspect of Servant, as the prototype of the diaconal ministry; and the exordium common to the Presbyters' and Bishop's Prayer sets as the backcloth (so to speak) of these ministries God's choice of a people for his own possession "to be a royal priesthood and a holy nation" having his only Son Jesus Christ for their "great High Priest and the Author of eternal salvation", who pours out his gifts of ministry "for the building up of his Body the Church, until his coming again in glory". The ministers of the Church are thus taught to see their ministries as participation in the ministerial work of the incarnate, risen and ascended Lord which will end only with The End.

The main and essential petition, its importance emphasized in print by the use of capitals, is accompanied by the laying on of hands. The usage will best be apprehended from full quotation from the Presbyters' Prayer:

> *The Bishop lays his hand upon the head of each person to be ordained in turn, the Presbyters also laying on their right hands; and the Bishop repeats the following words:*
>
> SEND DOWN THY HOLY SPIRIT UPON THY SERVANT . . . WHOM WE, IN THY NAME, AND IN OBEDIENCE TO THY MOST BLESSED WILL, DO NOW ORDAIN PRESBYTER IN THY CHURCH*, COMMITTING UNTO HIM AUTHORITY TO MINISTER THY WORD AND SACRAMENTS, TO DECLARE THY FORGIVENESS TO PENITENT SINNERS, AND TO SHEPHERD THY FLOCK.
>
> *The people each time repeat:* Amen.[2]

For deacons and bishops the main petition ends at the asterisk. For bishops, also, the relative clause reads, WHOM WE . . . DO NOW ORDAIN AND CONSECRATE BISHOP IN THY CHURCH.[3]

After the several recitals of the main petition for the presbyters, "the Bishop continues" the Prayer, "praying for all those ordained", that they may obtain the grace of their office, "Give them grace, we beseech thee, O Lord, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable unto thee. Enrich them in all utterance and in all knowledge, that they may proclaim the gospel of thy salvation. Make them watchful and loving guardians over thy flock, as followers of the Good Shepherd who gave his life for the sheep." The parallel clauses in the Bishop's Prayer run, "Give him grace, we beseech thee, to be a faithful ambassador of Christ to the world, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to thee, to feed and govern thy flock as a true shepherd, and to promote love and unity among all thy people". All three Prayers are fine

[1] It may be noticed that the preface form is not original or ancient, as the early Sacramentaries show; it was first grafted on to the ordination prayers circa A.D. 900.

[2] *Ordinal*, p. 11 f.

[3] *Ordinal*, p. 18.

compositions, and will bear favourable comparison with any of their historic equivalents.

At the end of the Prayer, a Bible is delivered, as an instrument of office, to deacons, presbyters and bishop alike, with appropriate formulae, the initial phrase of which is common to all, "Take this, a token of the authority which you have received . . ." The bishop, or the Moderator, then gives, as an accolade, "the right hand of fellowship to each of the newly ordained or to the newly consecrated, with the words, 'We give you the right hand of fellowship, and receive you to take part with us in this ministry'." After that, at a consecration, the new bishop receives, as the specific instrument of his office, the pastoral staff; the words of delivery are borrowed from the equivalent formula in the English Ordinal of 1550. The rites are thereupon formally concluded by a declaration pronounced by the bishop (or by the Moderator), "We declare that . . . are Deacons (or Presbyters, or Bishop) in the Church of God, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit". The people answer, "Amen. Thanks be to God".

How is the new *Ordinal* to be assessed? What is its quality? How does it stand in relation to the historic ordination rites of East and West? Let it be said at once that the Church of South India is eminently fortunate in its liturgists. To compose a rite is easy enough; but to compose one well is the reverse of easy, as many essays at liturgical composition prove. If the composers are not to fail, first they must know precisely what they are setting out to do, and then they must know how to do it; that is to say, they must know the basic principles and notions, the essential meaning and content of their rite, and they must possess a knowledge, to be acquired only by wide and careful study, of the many and diverse ways in which what they seek to do has already been done. The first kind of knowledge, of small practical value in itself, is indispensable for an effectual use of the second; the second, when exercised without control by the first, invariably issues in confusion. Both these kinds of knowledge, the second put to use most effectively, have conditioned the South Indian *Ordinal*. The composers have produced rites, the meaning and content of which echo those of the rites of the ancient Church. Commenting on early ordination prayers, Dom Botte observes, "Épiscopat, prêtrise et diaconat apparaissent, dans les anciens documents, moins comme des fonctions rituelles que comme des charismes destinés à l'édification de l'Église".[1] So do these ministries appear in the South Indian *Ordinal,* without, it should be noted, depreciation or neglect of the "fonctions rituelles". Liturgically also, the new rites resemble the ancient in simplicity of pattern, logic of movement, and economy of prayer and ceremony. Not, however, that there is any trace of archaizing for its own sake. The composers seem rather to have found the straightforward liturgical methods of Christian antiquity to be those most in accord with the tradition of the

[1] See his article, "L'Ordre d'après les prières d'ordination", in *Études sur le Sacrement de l'Ordre,* p. 34.

New Testament, and also best suited to local circumstances and needs.

It seems safe to predict that the South Indian rites will not provoke controversy about their "intention" and "validity". In making it plain beyond all question that the "form" of ordination and consecration, determining the application of the "matter", i.e. the laying on of hands, consists in the petition, SEND DOWN THY HOLY SPIRIT UPON THY SERVANT . . . WHOM WE . . . DO NOW ORDAIN [DEACON], etc., and further in conjoining the application of the matter with the recitation of the form, the South Indian liturgists have adopted a procedure faultless by the standards alike of Rome and the East. In essence the South Indian usage is analogous with that of the Orthodox Church;[1] but whereas the Orthodox rites appear to contemplate the recitation of the Ordination Prayers in full over each person being ordained,[2] the South Indian liturgists have devised a more convenient method without loss of significance or seemliness. If they were tempted at any time to introduce Anglican procedure at the act of ordination, they are to be congratulated on their wisdom in having preferred a practice which is both uncontroversial and congruous with Anglican principle, as it is also more accordant with the usage of "early times". They are to be congratulated again on their treatment of the delivery of the Bible as an "instrument of office". Even if the symbolic character of the ceremony had not been asserted in the preface, and the form of ordination and consecration had not been denoted distinctly, as it has been, the carefully framed formulae recited at the delivery of the Bible would forestall misunderstanding and misrepresentation. The delivery of the Bible is presumably derived from Anglican usage, being doubtless much valued by the former Anglican members of the Church of South India; but it is not, as it is in the English Ordering of Priests, an act conferring an authority. It is the "token" of an authority which has been already conferred at ordination through the Prayer and the laying on of hands. The South Indian formulae which signify the meaning of the ceremony, no less than the Ordination and Consecration Prayers, witness to their composers' understanding of the basic principles and notions of the historic ordination rites.

As a final word in praise of *The Ordinal,* the hope may be expressed that any Church of the Anglican communion proposing to revise its ordination rites will turn for guidance to the rites of South India. According to the first Edwardine Act of Uniformity, the compilers of the first English Prayer Book were instructed to have, in the discharge of their task, "as well eye and respect to the most sin-

[1] The rites of the Greek *Euchologion* prescribe two Ordination Prayers for each order. The rubrics direct that the bishop, while he recites these Prayers, shall have his hand resting upon the person being ordained or consecrated; this was probably early Roman usage also.

[2] That is to say that the Greek rubrics, like the directions of *Apostolic Tradition* and the earliest Roman Ordo for ordinations (M. Andrieu, *Les Ordines Romani,* Vol. III (1951), No. xxxiv), presuppose that only one deacon and only one presbyter are being ordained at a time.

cere and pure Christian religion as taught by Scripture, as to the usages in the primitive Church". Nowhere yet has this instruction been better fulfilled than in the South Indian *Ordinal.*

EDWARD C. RATCLIFF.

Commentaries on the Pastoral Epistles

DID St Paul write the Pastoral Epistles? If he did, how are we to explain the difference of mood and theological emphasis, both reflected in vocabulary, from, say, his acknowledged letters to the Galatians and Corinthians? Where are they to be fitted into the "Pauline" history? Was there a second imprisonment in Rome, between which and the first the Pastorals were written? Is the Church order reflected in the Pastorals unthinkable in St Paul's own lifetime? If he did not write them, how are we to explain innumerable touches in all three Epistles which are so recognizably Pauline? Are we indeed compelled to choose between, on the one hand, a pseudonymous author, familiar with the Pauline Epistles but concerned to address an audience in the middle of the second century and wanting apostolic backing for his exhortation, and, on the other, the patchwork quilt theory illustrated at the end of P. N. Harrison's *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles* (O.U.P., 1921) and forcefully argued throughout the book? Is there no significance in the fact that Clement of Rome seems to know them as Pauline; that Polycarp quotes from them; that Justin Martyr (circa A.D. 146) uses them; that Tertullian can cite Marcion's omission of them from his canon as evidence of heresy; that by the last quarter of the second century they are accepted as Pauline? None of this second-century evidence carries the force of proof, of course, but there is wisdom in the words of J. H. Bernard in *The Pastoral Epistles* (Macmillan, 1906), wisdom not lightly to be dismissed, where he says, "When speaking of early Christian literature it must always be remembered that, however fragmentary it be, it is the outcome of the continuous life of a society, a society which has been ever jealous of change" (p. xxi). In other words, it is possible that from our distant perspective we exaggerate the differences between the churches to whom Paul wrote and those to whom Polycarp wrote and those to whom Irenaeus wrote.

All this is not to argue a case but to indicate what is certainly the evidence of the commentaries that the question of the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals is still open. One is not necessarily in the *avant garde* of modern scholarship if one insists that St Paul could not possibly have written them. To accept his authorship is not evidence of obscurantism.

I have thus introduced this review of the available commentaries in English only in order to show what a range of questions lie before the student who undertakes a serious study of the Pastoral Epistles.

Available commentaries seem to me to fall into four categories. There are, *first,* those whose whole approach to these Epistles can be

said to be dominated by this question of authorship, and the position taken on this question determines the way in which the text is expounded. Notable among those which, being so "dominated", give their verdict against Pauline authorship are B. S. Easton's *The Pastoral Epistles* (S.C.M. Press, 1948), P. N. Harrison in the book already mentioned which, however, is less a commentary than an argument about vocabulary; *The Pastoral Epistles,* by E. F. Scott (The Moffatt New Testament Commentary, Hodder and Stoughton, 1936); F. D. Gealy's introduction to and exegesis of the Pastoral Epistles in *The Interpreter's Bible* (Abingdon Press, U.S.A., 1955). With these should perhaps be taken E. J. Goodspeed's *An Introduction to the New Testament* (University of Chicago Press, 1937).

A very valuable feature of Easton's book is that part devoted to Word Studies, in which the key words of these Epistles are picked out for special attention. Opinion seems to be hardening against any argument about the authorship of the Pastorals based primarily on such an analysis of vocabulary as is given by P. N. Harrison. But whatever be the verdict on Harrison's argument about vocabulary the reader will be grateful for the skilful reconstruction of what Harrison recognizes as the authentic Pauline elements in the Pastorals. Nevertheless, one reader at least is left wondering why, having achieved so remarkable a camel, Harrison has so much trouble over the gnats. E. F. Scott's volume will be found to have a real devotional value, but the reader should remain on the alert to challenge a great many of the author's antitheses between the Pastorals and the acknowledged Pauline letters.

Of those commentaries which are likewise "dominated" by the issue of authorship, two may be mentioned which are strongly committed to the authorship being that of St Paul. J. H. Bernard's book has already been mentioned. In his third chapter—"The Style and Vocabulary of the Pastoral Epistles"—he presents some cogent points to show that the arguments against Pauline authorship based on style and vocabulary are inconclusive. A more recent defence of the Pauline authorship is that by E. K. Simpson in *The Pastoral Epistles —The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* (Tyndale Press, 1954). The commentary is illuminated by the author's own extensive knowledge of Greek literature in its whole range, though references to authors would be more valuable if dated, for words do in fact, change their values with the centuries. Some readers will regret the tone of passages which attack the conclusions of scholars who doubt the Pauline authorship, though, in all conscience, some of these latter are not innocent of *hubris* or void of offence. But the cause of truth is seldom advanced by knocking the other fellow down, even if only verbally.

A *second* category, which has affinities with the *first* and with the *fourth* but which deserves to be distinguished, contains only one volume—*The Pastoral Epistles,* by Walter Lock (International Critical Commentary, 1924). I place this volume in a class by itself because, on the issue of authorship, Lock is so eminently judicious, going far more deeply than any of the others into the real issues in-

volved, at least so it seems to me. While he inclines to the Pauline authorship he does so without in any way belittling the problems involved. He has, incidentally, an interesting section on the impact of these Epistles on the liturgical life of the Church.

A *third* category of commentaries are those which in effect dismiss the question of authorship as of altogether secondary importance, and which are concerned almost exclusively with understanding the relevance of the Pastoral Epistles for Christians of modern times. One of these is H. P. Liddon's *Explanatory Analysis of St Paul's First Letter to Timothy* (Longmans, 1897). I have found no other book which, within its limited purpose, so successfully indicates what the author of 1 Timothy was trying to say. This method, as here applied, incidentally affords abundant material for the student at his devotions, for the teacher preparing for his class, and for the preacher preparing for the pulpit. Another volume in this category is *The Pastoral Epistles*, by E. F. Brown (Westminster Commentaries, 1917). The distinctive character of this volume is that it is the *only* commentary on these Epistles in English which, so far as I have discovered, draws for illustration upon the experience of the Church overseas. The author was himself a missionary, which explains this phenomenon, pathetic in its rarity, for I am convinced that the answer to many of the questions raised by the Pastoral Epistles will never be found in textual criticism but only in the experience of the missionary Church—the Church, that is, which is actively engaged in Mission. A *third* volume in this category is *The Epistles to Timothy and Titus*, by A. E. Humphreys (C.U.P., 1894). Of particular interest is the author's study in the development of Pauline doctrine. If the argument is somewhat too schematic it yet affords a hint towards the relationship of the Pastoral Epistles to the Pauline "Corpus", which deserves attention. *The Pastoral Epistles,* by A. Plummer (The Expositor's Bible, Hodder and Stoughton, 7th ed., 1892), belongs with these.

The *fourth* category contains two books which, as commentaries designed to set minds and hearts on fire, are in their several ways equally to be commended. One is *The Pastoral Epistles,* by E. St J. Parry (C.U.P., 1920). The other is *The Pastoral Epistles—an Introduction and Commentary*, by Donald Guthrie (Tyndale Press, 1957). Both deal adequately with the question of authorship, but neither is obsessed with it. Both argue reasonably and courteously in favour of Pauline authorship, but insist on pressing the reader to discover what is the real message of these Epistles. Of the two volumes, that by Parry is the more substantial as a work of scholarship. The Greek text is printed and there is an invaluable verse by verse commentary on this. It belongs to the tradition of such commentaries as those of Lightfoot, and more recently of Selwyn. No more than they, however, is it ever the "cold porridge" of mere scholarship. It lends itself to prayer. This last quality it shares with the volume by Donald Guthrie. Here the Greek text is not provided, but the Greek words necessary for the exposition are transliterated. For the ordinary reader and the busy parish priest it is as valuable as anything else

written on the subject. Perhaps it might be added here that Mr Guthrie has also written a booklet entitled *The Pastoral Epistles and the Mind of Paul* (Tyndale Press, 1955) which is a quite admirable illustration of the right way in which to conduct a theological debate.

Admirable as some of these commentaries most certainly are, I would hazard the judgment that we must await the "great" commentary on the Pastorals until a writer has arisen who has pioneered the Gospel in a pre-Christian community, has seen the Church established in a multitude of small congregations, and then found himself compelled to deal with problems of Church Order. This has happened in the experience of many an individual missionary. We may expect it to happen to many more. What has not yet happened has been the conjunction in one man of this range of experience, with a capacity for careful scholarship *and*, most necessary of all, the *leisure to marry the two.* What is quite certain is that when this book is written many a confident statement about what could or could not have been written by Paul the pioneer missionary in Galatia as well as by Paul the aged watching anxiously over the development of the Church, will be exposed as ignorant *non-sequiturs* based on theories divorced from life.

There remain certain questions which these commentaries of ours fail to ask but which are surely far more important than the question of authorship. What, for instance, was the significance for the Christians of the first century of the change of emphasis between Galatians and Romans—between redemption from bondage under the law to redemption from bondage under sin? Was this development perhaps necessary before the Christian mind could tackle the problem of working out the full meaning of *nomos Christou* (Gal. 6. 2) without becoming legalistic? May we not see in the Pastoral Epistles a first attempt at such an outworking? Is it here that we can look for the real link between the Pastorals and the Pauline "ten"?

I read recently a thesis by an African on "The Problem of Christian Ethics in Nigeria". In it he wrote as follows: "We do believe, however, that owing to the nature of things in Nigeria to-day, when culture happens to be in a state of transition, the Christian Church, if it is going to influence the new culture, must have a set of norms—in relation to particular problems incident upon the conduct of the people." A Christian culture was in embryo from St Paul's first missionary journey. Are not his acknowledged Epistles full of evidence as to how urgent it was becoming to indicate the content of the *nomos Christou,* to provide a set of norms? The experience of the Church overseas of our day would seem to suggest that the Pastoral Epistles describe a situation and deal with problems which would be pressing upon the leaders of the Church within a very few years of the first preaching of the Gospel.

There remains an even more urgent question in search of an answer. What are we to say of the widespread tendency among Christians in all ages to make, in effect, a choice between the letter to the Galatians and the Pastorals as a guide to life? Galatians has been interpreted, contrary to Paul's intention, as pointing towards

a mystical inwardness of experience only to be captured by the few. The Pastorals have been viewed as practical, which they are, but then assumed to be prosaic and easily within reach of ordinary men, which they are not, so failing to recognize the heroism implicit in routine. The two have been divorced from each other when they belong together. But see where this separation leads us. Life in the Spirit becomes something only mystics can enjoy. The rest must be content with a pedestrian life of rule and regulation with no vision of the heights. Before we know where we are love ceases to be a risk and becomes a nicely calculated exercise in benevolence. We find ourselves on the brink of confining the inexhaustible riches of Christ to the few—to the twice-born—when they are meant to be the heritage of every man. That that tendency has been a fact can hardly be denied. One of our urgent needs in the Church is to demonstrate that there is nothing in the Pastoral Epistles *untrue* to the Pauline emphasis; nothing which is not implicit in his teaching and which must therefore become explicit when that teaching is put into Christian action. Where that demonstration is attempted the question of authorship will perhaps be found to have looked after itself.

These questions are crucial for Christian thinking. They are of vital importance for the Mission of the Church. On what theology do we base the Church's long acquiescence in a "double standard" of spiritual objective—heroic virtue for the few, humdrum morality for the many? Why is Paul forgotten for centuries and then rediscovered briefly by an Irenaeus, an Augustine, a Luther and a Wesley —and loved extravagantly by revivalists? Indeed, does not Revival itself pose a tremendous theological problem for the Church?

No one in touch with the Churches in Asia and Africa to-day, conscious of the tragic way they have imitated the legalism and formalism of the Churches of the West, the while they have so largely failed to make their own the missionary enthusiasm out of which they were born, can doubt the importance of seeking an answer to these questions. The fact that Revival movements seem the only way to salvage a Church which has succumbed to the temptation to "settle on its lees" surely challenges us to try to discover if this is the only way, if this is something implicit in the Gospel, or if it is not rather the fruit of allowing a fatal dichotomy to invade the life of the Church so that the Epistle to the Galatians and the Pastorals are set over against one another instead of being treated as indispensable to one another.

Is the answer not that both are meant to be held in a painful tension in the life of every Church and of every congregation all the time? We still await a commentary which will interpret the Pastoral Epistles as one half of the answer to that question.

M. A. C. Warren.

A Factory Chaplain

Every minister, Anglican or Free Church, must know the growing sense of frustration produced by awareness of the fact that some

90 per cent of the population remain untouched by our ministrations. Do what we will we just cannot *get at them*. An experiment which has now gone on weekly for four years may suggest one way of facing the situation. It is far from being suggested that it is the only way. Certainly it must be used as well as, not instead of, our more orthodox ministrations. Here is the course of events as they actually happened.

It all began when I was asked to lunch with the directors of a machine tool factory employing 420 men, most of them very highly skilled. After our meal the managing director put his case. The factory had been a family business but was now part of a combine, though the top directives had carried on from the old family organization. Working conditions were good, wages high, and welfare plans excellent, but it was felt that if the old personal relations were to be perpetuated something more was needed. Could I suggest anything?

I put over the notion of a factory chaplain, basing his work on three main principles. Trade union officials must first be told of the scheme at managerial level. I must be known to be unpaid. I must have free access at all times and my dealings with the men must be absolutely confidential. The conditions were at once accepted, and I started work the following week.

One day in my week is set aside for the job, and nothing is allowed to interfere, i.e. it is given priority parallel with that of the Sunday services. Being well over seventy, there is a limit to the time during which I can really keep active, alert, and able to "give out", but my own hours are 10.30 a.m. to 3.30 p.m., lunch being taken in the canteen. Starting at the bottom of the shop I work my way up the aisle, watching this man at his fascinating job, passing the time of day with that man, and pausing to talk to another about his personal affairs. Never do I mention religion unless they start the topic. Now, after four years' acquaintance, they frequently do!

At first it was a very anxious sort of job. The men were suspicious, and I had to feel my way, making I must admit great use of such low-brow enthusiasms as those for soccer, cricket, fishing, and so on. Slowly the ice cracked, largely because the word went round, "He won't shove religion down your throat", as well as because it became known that I loved to share a good joke. The crack became a complete break when one day a deeply respected workman asked me to go and see his old father, who was ill. Thus it is that to-day I never come away from the factory without having noted down requests for visits to be paid. The shop stewards are invaluable in telling me such things as that George is getting married on Saturday, or that Frank is in deep distress because of the loss of his mother, or that Bill's little girl has had to be taken to hospital. Thus it is that to-day there is hardly a man on the factory floor with whom some real contact has not been made. In an odd way it is absolutely different from orthodox parish visiting. You see the *men*, not the women, and that on their own ground, not yours. When later on you do go to their houses, the reception is absolutely different. "I've heard all about you from my old man", the wives say, and you are in touch as one

human being with another, not in the often sticky atmosphere which is apt to be created by "a visit from the minister".

Note that there is no question of sermons or services. This is an entirely *pastoral* approach, using the factory as a unit. In my visits they, so to speak, call the tune, dictate the way in which the conversation shall run. My job is not only to *care* but to be *seen* to care, and as a result to be used. Housing and domestic difficulties, sickness, education, religion—on all these and similar subjects advice is sought and given, and contact is established. If it all sounds very serious and professional I have failed in my effort to suggest that the whole basis is friendliness, certainly a sense of equality on which the fraternity is based, the whole relation lit and relieved by a sense of humour on both sides. If you want it put in a more theological way, it is all based on the conviction that the Holy Spirit is communicable on the floor of a factory as well as in church.

To me the importance of this experiment in a small factory is greatly enhanced because it can be done by any minister who is humble, simple, loves folk, and cares deeply what happens to them. More, as I said at the start, it can be done by such men as part of their normal ministry. In my own city some score of us are doing it, a third or more of them Free Church ministers. When the experiment began I happened to be Canon Missioner, but *all* the rest of us are doing normal jobs in the Anglican or Free Churches. We all meet regularly to discuss our work and we carefully avoid overlapping.

Note that this particular form of factory chaplaincy will not work with the conveyor-belt system. The maximum size of the factory or section of a factory which can be worked by one man is not, I think, more than 500 men—but remember there are scores of such factories in any normal industrial area.

Note, too, that this experiment has not, as its immediate object, "getting men to church". The whole idea is to convince the working man that we of religion *care* about him—body, mind and soul. Put it that we hope that if we can manage to take God to him, that may well be a first step towards bringing him to God.

E. Moore Darling.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Mascall is a Student of Christ Church and Lecturer in the Philosophy of Religion in the University of Oxford.

The Rev. Edward C. Ratcliff is Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford.

Dr Warren is General Secretary of the Church Missionary Society and an Honorary Canon of Truro Cathedral.

The Rev. E. Moore Darling is a Canon of Coventry Cathedral.

CORRESPONDENCE

EPISCOPACY AND INTERCOMMUNION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The Bishop of Woolwich, by his plea in your October issue for "concelebration", gives a new turn to the argument in favour of seeking unity by way of intercommunion. It is perhaps inevitable that in a brief article he has left unanswered a number of questions that require an answer before we can follow his lead.

I do not ask now whether phrases like "a gimmick for validating sacraments" are a sufficient way of dealing with the millions of Anglicans and the many more millions of Orthodox and Roman Catholic Christians who desire an episcopally ordained priest as the consecrator of the Eucharist. It is to be hoped that the bishop has no wish to encourage the prevalent, but oddly provincial, notion that only some Anglicans have this desire. But I think we must ask what "intercommunion" means.

No answer can be satisfactory unless we face the prior question, What are we doing at the table of the Lord? Are we "breaking a common loaf", or are we doing something more than that? The bishop does not say; but in using phrases like "celebrations of non-episcopal churches" and "their orders and sacraments", he seems to take it for granted that celebrations, orders and sacraments mean substantially, if not in every doctrinal nuance, the same thing for all parties concerned. My reading and my contacts with my fellow-Christians in this country and in Europe lead me to think that this is far from certain.

What is a "communion service"? Is it the same thing, does it purport to be the same thing (in substance, not in externals) in an Orthodox or Roman Catholic church or in thousands of Anglican churches throughout the world as it is in, say, a Swiss Protestant, a Dutch Reformed or a Baptist church? What are "orders"? A prophetic calling, recognized as such by a Christian congregation, and needing nothing more to validate it? Or a sacramentally conferred commission to "the office and work of a priest in the Church of God"? And what are the sacraments that are the bone of contention? Not baptism, for who doubts the validity of baptism conferred with the proper form and matter by a non-episcopal minister? Nor ought we to doubt the spiritual value of the fellowship meal of a Christian congregation, remembering their Lord, at which such a minister or, in his absence, an approved layman presides. But is this sacred meal that eucharistic sacrifice for which the Fathers of the Church and the vast majority of Christians throughout the ages have made such high claims?

The difficulty that presents itself to me is this: if we are to practise concelebration of the kind the bishop desires, can we do it with spiritual reality until we come to something like a common mind—

I do not say unanimity—about these problems? Is eucharistic doctrine and practice so irrelevant to the question of intercommunion as all that? It is perhaps putting it too sharply to say, Must we not at least know where what is substantially the agape ends and where what is substantially the eucharist begins, and why they are different things? But the facts of the situation do not seem to me to make the question an unreal one.

Yours faithfully,
H. Balmforth.

6 The Close,
Exeter.

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

The article on "Episcopacy and Intercommunion", by the Bishop of Woolwich, in the October number of Theology, must have struck many an answering chord in the hearts of those passionately concerned for reunion. He is right in declaring that "approaches" to the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches have reached a lamentable *impasse*; and he is dead right in his diagnosis of the trouble—namely, that we commend episcopacy to the Free Churches on the wrong ground, and "argue it, not as a basis of unity, but as the condition of intercommunion".

Episcopacy as the only practicable basis for the reunion of Christendom is generally accepted (as the bishop says) by all responsible Christian leaders, of whatever denomination. But episcopacy as necessary for validating sacraments and for an effective ministry is (as he emphasizes) something "no non-episcopal Church will stand, *or ought to stand*". Moreover, it is not the traditional doctrine of the Church of England which, in its Ordinal, while asserting that "from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons", casts no reflection on the ministries of other Churches. The argument that the Ordering of Priests, in declaring "how *necessary* that Order is in the Church of Christ", refers to consecrating a valid sacrament, cannot be sustained; for an identical statement introduces the making of deacons. Nor is the Bishop of Woolwich alone in his contentions. There is a formidable body of leading professors of theology, as also of bishops, who would never dream of questioning the reality and validity of non-episcopal Orders. Indeed, most approaches to other communions, such as *Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church* (p. 21), quote the Lambeth Report, 1930 (p. 48), in confirming that "we emphatically declare that we do not call in question the spiritual reality of the ministries now exercised in non-episcopal communions"; as also the Lambeth Conference of 1920 that "these ministries have manifestly been blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace". At the same time we seem to give the lie to such affirmations by forbidding

reciprocal acts of intercommunion in Free Church chapels such as are allowed in Anglican churches.

It is not sufficiently realized that individual Anglicans are allowed to follow their own conscience in this matter of receiving the sacrament from non-episcopal ministers in certain circumstances. Still less that in South India, as also in schemes of reunion (such as those of Ceylon and North India) non-episcopally ordained ministers are allowed to celebrate Holy Communion on visits to those territories. "Such anomalies", the Lambeth Report, 1958, asserts (part 2, p. 35), "are bound to continue until reunion progresses further in other parts of the world." But, however grudgingly, the principle of reciprocal intercommunion has hereby been conceded, and it should be accepted in this country as a practice of economy towards achieving reunion on an episcopal basis.

Increasingly, with more and more conferences and gatherings of Christians organized by both the World and the British Council of Churches, Anglican delegates will be invited to share in the United Service of Holy Communion arranged by the particular Church of the country where the assembly is held. Already many Anglican leaders refuse to be persuaded from sharing in such a service. But it has been laid down by authority that young people are to be forbidden from such participation at international youth gatherings, such as at Bangor some years ago. The result is an increasing number of "angry young men", who sooner, rather than later, will insist on obeying conscience before authority.

Increasingly, too, parish clergy are becoming restive at the present position. For many years past, now, with the direct encouragement of the Convocations and Lambeth, they have been organizing united gatherings, conferences, services and missions with the local Free Churches; and the result of such drawing together has frequently and naturally culminated in a united service of Holy Communion in an Anglican Church. As is only to be expected, such clergy with their people are now demanding permission to pay a return visit to the local chapel; and they cannot understand what hinders their truly Christian urge to do so.

But the burning issue, of course, is that approaches to the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches are bogged down till we show that we believe in the "regularity" of their sacraments by participating in them. The Methodists, for example, agree in an initial unification of ministries on an episcopal basis, but add that "the problem which faces us is, how to carry out this unification without calling upon anyone to repudiate his former ministry" (*Conversations,* etc., p. 44). At present it is not possible. Schemes for reunion may protest that the Rite of Unification of Ministries "does not imply a denial of the reality of the ordination previously received"; but the formula of the rite can be interpreted as more than a mutual commission by the laying on of hands for an extended ministry as in the case of Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13. 1–3); and include the grace of episcopal orders for consecrating a valid sacrament. Something big is needed to convince other communions that we *accept* their ministries, not

merely refrain from passing judgment upon them; and that *something* clearly is that our present careful regulations for intercommunion should be made reciprocal.

Till then individual parish priests can welcome the interim arrangement of concelebration, adumbrated by the Bishop of Woolwich. Also, leading theologians can prepare the Church of England for the action it is bound to take sooner or later by giving us a volume of essays on "Episcopacy and the Sacraments". For example, according to Catholic tradition, lay baptisms are considered valid though (except in emergency) irregular. Does the same principle apply to lay celebrations of Holy Communion? If not, why not?

Your obedient servant,

CHRISTOPHER ROFFEN.

BISHOPSCOURT,
ROCHESTER.

SIN AND INFANT BAPTISM

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Towards the end of his admirable article in the November issue the Rev. J. S. Bezzant states that "baptism which does not *include* 'the remission of sins' is not Christian baptism, and this, in the case of infants, is meaningless".

Like most parish priests, I have long felt the weight of the difficulties and anomalies he instances; but I would question whether the remission of sins in the case of infants is *quite* meaningless.

Before a baptism begins I have for some years been in the habit of trying to explain to those present the meaning of what is about to happen, since what does happen is extremely important but not very obvious. I explain that reception into the Church becomes significant when seen as reception into the primary unit of the Church, namely a Christian home, and the gift of the Spirit significant when seen as reception into a home where the Spirit is consciously obeyed and his atmosphere breathed. But it is on the last point, forgiveness, that I feel most uncertain. I try to explain it in terms such as these: "Thirdly, most difficult of all, this is the moment when the child receives what the Prayer Book calls the forgiveness of sins. Children of this age, however, haven't yet committed any sins, but unfortunately, because our human nature has been damaged, they will. Therefore through the quality of your forbearance towards their offences against yourselves they will begin to understand what it means to be forgiven by Christ. This is, so to speak, the moment when Christ receives us into a covenant of forgiveness, on the strength of which all our future sins are forgiven. Hence the whole meaning of infant baptism hangs on the quality of the home. Without the Christian home in the background, we are getting perilously near to magic in what we are going to do."

The remark about the covenant of forgiveness represents the view

of Jeremy Taylor, and almost his own words. I am quite prepared to be told that this is so much nonsense, but at the same time I should value suggested improvements.

Yours faithfully,
J. K. Byrom.

Cheadle Hulme.

BOOK REVIEWS

Man and the Incarnation: A Study in the Biblical Theology of Irenaeus. By Gustaf Wingren. Translated by Ross Mackenzie. Oliver and Boyd. 1959. 21s.

This is a book that should rejoice the hearts and heads of both patristic scholars and ordinary students of theology. It is a work of a theologian whose knowledge of his subject is surpassing great, and yet who writes in such fashion that theological students of whatever speciality will find his treatment of Irenaean theology immensely valuable. Almost every feature of the book is appealing; the disposition of the material and the extensive documentation are particularly noteworthy. One could wish, however, for a style of writing that savoured rather less of the Nordic lecture room and more carefully avoided wearisome repetitions.

The main problem of theology for Irenaeus, according to Prof. Wingren, is man and the becoming man, or man and the Incarnation. Every significant concept of the great early Church Father's thought is subjected to a systematic analysis in the light of this central problem, and the "monumental simplicity" and "inner unity and consistency" of his teaching are convincingly set forth. The book is divided into three parts, the first of which deals with God's creation and man's defeat and bondage. The second part treats Irenaeus' doctrine of the Christ in terms of his understanding of *recapitulatio* and *imago* and *similitudo*, and the relation between God and man in the Incarnation. In this analysis the author points out the way in which Irenaeus "holds Creation and Incarnation together", showing that for him "the same force underlies both" (p. 84), and also that in the view of the saint, the divinity and the humanity of the Incarnation, far from being mutually exclusive or set over against one another, are "profoundly connected" (p. 107, pp. 98–9). The victory of Christ over the forces of sin and death, and the meaning of recapitulation in the redemptive process are discussed with clarity and precision in the last section of the second part of the book. Contrary to the view of a number of nineteenth-century scholars, chief among whom was Harnack, the writer seeks to prove that the so-called "physical" and "ethical" aspects of the work of our Lord constitute a unity in Irenaeus' thought. The final part of the volume is given over to a searching examination of Irenaeus' doctrine of the Church and his ideas on the consummation, the key concepts of recapitulation and the image and likeness of God being discussed in terms of both.

In addition to being a first-rate introduction to Irenaean theology, the importance of this book lies not a little in the fact that it was written by a Swedish thinker who has entered deeply into the theology of the Lutheran Reformation and into that of Barth, Brunner and Bultmann, but who finds in the early Christian Fathers "parts of the biblical message which are interpreted in greater clarity and power than in any later period of Christian thought" (p. xi), and who is, moreover, as full of praise for Irenaeus' anthropology as he is ready to criticize contemporary "theologians who are attempting to free themselves from the liberal Protestant tradition by simply remaining silent about man, or by being detrimental in their references to man" (p. 94). It is to be hoped that this work on a theologian whose central theme might be stated, without much loss, in the Augustinian precept that grace does not destroy nature but restores and perfects it, will demand widespread attention from English readers.

James A. Carpenter.

King's College,
Cambridge.

The Light and the Rainbow. A Study in Christian Spirituality, By Hilda Graef. Longmans. 35s.

This is an important book because it deals historically with the main themes of Christian spirituality—the image of God in man, the inter-relation between morality and spirituality, and the paradox of the transcendence and nearness of God. Miss Graef has had to be selective in a work of such scope, and the principle of selection has been the choice of those writers who not only influenced their own time and environment but also influenced later developments. In the Old Testament there are adumbrations of the themes of Christian spirituality. In the New Testament the light of the revelation of God shines in the world in the presence of Christ and in the lives of his followers. In the development of Christian spirituality from Origen through to St Teresa of Lisieux the light is reflected in the many-coloured rainbow of men and women from diverse cultural backgrounds and differing temperaments. As with the development of Christian doctrine, so also with the development of Christian spirituality, the contribution of writers of many different gifts and training goes into the exposition of the record of Christ's revelation of God. In the development of Christian spirituality, however, there is always the claim of experiential awareness that gives a sense of immediacy and reality to the words which the writer uses. While the theologian in Gregory of Nyssa is never far divorced from the mystic, it is the mystic who speaks of the approach of the soul to God, in terms, it must be admitted, drawn from Greek philosophy and civic life. In the mystical speculation of the Greeks one feels that there is a tacit unitarianism in the way the writers speak of their knowledge of God, but this is offset by the firm trinitarian belief expressed in their apprehension of the saving and redemptive operation of God.

The Greek aspiration towards God is complemented by the Augustinian emphasis upon the indwelling of God in the soul. The medieval devotion to Christ the Man, more familiar to us than the spirituality of the Greeks, remained under the influence of the Greek notion of stages in the aspiration of the soul towards God, and Miss Graef warns us that the medieval way of reaching the mystic union of the soul with God risked falling into a sensual emotionalism without the intellectual element prized by the Fathers. She shows how St Bernard countered this danger without losing his apprehension of the union of the contemplative with the divinity of Christ by way of the divine humanity.

The richness of this book consists in the penetrating insight of Miss Graef into the depths of the thought of so many mystics with so many insights into the union of the Christian soul and its creator. We are led to see the persisting influences of the early writers upon later systems of spirituality; we are given the Carmelite emphasis upon the union of the soul and God consisting in the union of the will of man with the will of God; and finally we are given the simplicity of the spirituality of St Teresa of Lisieux, whom Miss Graef calls the "saint of the common man". The book abounds in perceptive evaluations of the contributions of the many writers to whom she refers, and there is a fine discussion of the psychology of mystics on p. 325. It is valuable, too, to have an account of the development of spirituality which links that of the New Testament with that of the medieval writers. In this we are able to see a continuous development of thought, and the apparent isolation of medieval spirituality from the New Testament is seen to be unreal when we are led to see the development of spirituality undertaken by the Christian Fathers, into whose inheritance the middle ages entered.

In this excellent book it was possible to discover only one error, on p. 48, where Miss Graef mis-names the deity of Gen. 1. 26, calling him "Yahweh" instead of "Elohim".

G. H. Walden.

Brisbane.

Miracles and Revelation. By J. S. Lawton. Lutterworth Press. 1959. 37s. 6d.

This book is in effect a survey of apologetics in England since about 1700, during the whole of which period, as the author points out, the questions of miracle and revelation have been in the forefront. Some foreign names appear, but not Lessing, Kant, Kierkegaard, Ritschl. A great number of writers bob up, and quickly vanish, and inevitably the reader feels that some of the great (Butler, Hume, Mansel . . .) have less than justice done to them, and that many others were scarcely worth reviving. Thus one apologist says that "human free will does not violate the idea of law . . . but it does force us to recognize that there is an *intrusion of spirit* into the physical order" (Bernard, on p. 142: not quite his own terms); another that "physical laws are suspended whenever an animate being moves part of its

body" (J. B. Mozley, alas, on p. 141); and a third that "the idea of miracle is implicit in the concept of 'emergent evolution'. The process of evolution contains new, and therefore discontinuous, qualities and values, whose *miraculousness* is obscured by the vast time (etc.)" (Harris, pp. 231–2). A. E. Taylor and Sparrow Simpson contradict each other, without the author's view being clear, on pp. 204–5. There are some oddities, like "Personal religion had indeed been well understood *since the time of Wesley*", on pp. 125–6. (All italics mine.) The effect of reading a large number of statements of this kind was to make the reviewer feel that he had lost his bearings for good.

No doubt the fault is with the apologists rather than with the author, who says, indeed, that the function of the apologist is to use, not so much the best arguments, as those most convincing at the time of writing.

Some of the historical perspectives will be questioned: in particular, the eighteenth-century theology is hardly treated. Was it so *very* intellectualist, arid, external? Did not Butler himself attack a religion "so very reasonable, as to have nothing to do with the heart and affections"? The main thesis of the book, that "miracle has moved from the circumference to the very centre of revelation", must be heavily qualified by a really close examination of Butler's important chapter, wherein he distinguishes (*a*) revelation—i.e. the whole body of revealed religion—as *itself* miraculous; (*b*) *invisible* miracles; and (*c*) *visible* miracles which attest, and point to, the invisible. Perhaps the author tends, when speaking of the eighteenth century, to concentrate on category (*c*), and to speak of (*a*) and (*b*) as if it had been left to a later age to discover them.

The importance of the long Broad Church tradition emerges clearly. Evidence writers, liberal historians, modernists—they all kept a sense of the importance of fixing what actually happened (though they lacked "historical imagination"), and regarded theology as interesting and important to the "ordinary educated man", rather than as the concern of a small professional circle.

In pp. 51–8 I felt that Hume's treatment of causality was not made clear, and that thus not only the discussion of the chapter "Of Miracles" (where the arguments are drawn from A. E. Taylor's lecture, and ignore the question of the date of writing), but also the entire subsequent discussion of the development of science were weakened. For the complicated histories of the notions of scientific "law" and the problem of induction are not convincingly handled. Few scientists will be pleased, nowadays, to learn that their sanity depends upon the postulate of the uniformity of nature; nor will philosophers like this quotation, with the verb "transmit": "Since Hume's time it had come to be increasingly recognized that physical causes were only antecedents, or conditions that transmit causation that they cannot originate" (p.231).

The author does not really make clear what he understands by the terms *faith, revelation, nature, miracle.* It is not quite enough, for example, to speak of "God's *personal* intervention through specific events"; for when a revelation occurs, the recipients still perceive

only the *effects* of God, not his naked presence. What is it that is special about *these* effects which makes us call them miraculous, and a revelation? Nor is it enough to say that many notable theologians have come to believe that revelation is *self-authenticating*, in view of the strong philosophical attacks lately made upon the notion of self-authenticating religious experiences.

A very difficult subject, and an interesting book.

Don Cupitt.

Salford.

St Grégoire Palamas et la Mystique orthodoxe. By Jean Meyendorff. Editions du Seuil. 1959. N.p.

This little paper-backed volume, which, like the others in the series *Maitres spirituels*, is most attractively produced and is illustrated by a profusion of brilliantly selected pictures, can only be compared with Vladimir Lossky's *Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* for its importance as a contribution to the theological rapprochement of Eastern and Western Christendom. It falls into three parts. The first is a concise and clear account of the spiritual tradition of Eastern monasticism, from Evagrius Ponticus and Macarius down to Symeon the New Theologian and the hesychasts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries; it is fascinating to compare and contrast this development with that of the Christian West. The second part consists of a discussion of the life and theological thought of the great Archbishop of Thessalonica whose name forms the title of the book. The third part traces the development of Orthodox spirituality from his time to the present day.

To a Western mind, especially one which is temperamentally sympathetic to the Thomist outlook, there is much that is baffling in the basic positions of Eastern Orthodox theology and spirituality as they are usually presented. The main impression, however, that is left upon the reader by Dr Meyendorff's book is that, whatever may be the case as regards verbal idiom and philosophical setting, there is a fundamental agreement between St Gregory Palamas and St Thomas Aquinas as regards the theological and religious truths that the two great thinkers were concerned to maintain. No one could be more surprised to discover this than was the present reviewer, and it will be well to justify this impression by specific examples.

Take, first, the famous controversy between St Gregory and the Calabrian monk Barlaam about the uncreated light. Whether Barlaam knew the works of his contemporary William of Ockham is doubtful, but what is certain is that he was a professed nominalist and opponent of Thomism: "Barlaam, who fled in the West from the intellectual realism of the Thomist scholasticism, threw himself in the East against the mystical realism of the monks." In fact, Dr Meyendorff tells us, his two great tenets were nominalism and essentialism; and these are the two *bêtes noires* of Thomism, as M. Maritain and M. Gilson have taken such pains to make clear to us. If the Eastern Church, under the leadership of Palamas, had not firmly

suppressed this nominalist movement, Dr Meyendorff somewhat pointedly maintains, it would have been led into "a crisis like that which the Christian West has undergone, namely the neo-paganism of the Renaissance and the Reformation of the Church in conformity with the new nominalist philosophy".

Viewed from this aspect, even the doctrine of the divine energies appears in a less baffling light. Recent commentators have seen the heart of St Thomas's thought to lie in its firm hold upon the principle of existence (*esse*), in contrast with the primacy given to the principle of essence by both his opponents and his more pedestrian disciples. Now, according to Dr Meyendorff, it was precisely to counteract the essentialist trend that Palamas developed *his* distinction between the divine essence and the divine energies; it is noteworthy that, just as many modern Thomists have hailed St Thomas as the true existentialist, Dr Meyendorff gives this honourable title to St Gregory. It would, of course, be rash in the extreme to identify the divine existence in Thomism with the divine energy in Palamism; nevertheless, it would be a fascinating and a really important question for investigation whether Thomas and Gregory were not ultimately concerned with the same theological and religious truth, rather than merely developing divergent metaphysical theories. Admittedly, the Palamite insistence upon the basic unknowability of God seems at first sight to be directly contrary to the Thomist doctrine that God is supremely knowable; nevertheless, some Thomists, such as Fr Victor White, have discerned in Aquinas an agnosticism which has almost scandalized some of their less intrepid colleagues, and it would seem to be at least arguable that the conflict is less than it appears to be at first sight. If we cannot simply equate *existence* with *energy*, perhaps we can see a difference between *essence* as it is understood by the Aristotelian Thomas and by the neo-Platonist Palamas, and the reconciliation may lie along this line.

Again, the *apophaticism*, the stress upon the negative way in our approach to God, which is so characteristic of Palamas and of Eastern Christian theology and spirituality generally, almost inevitably raises suspicion in the Western mind. Is it, however, so very different from what we find in St John of the Cross? And if M. Maritain is able to allay our fears in the case of the great Spanish Carmelite by a skilful application of Thomist epistemology and a discreet distinction between the language of theoretical and practical theology (I am thinking of his work *The Degrees of Knowledge*, which is at last available in an adequate English translation), may not the Palamites be performing the same task when they assure us that God, though inaccessible in his essence, fully communicates himself in his energies? Would St John of the Cross in fact have found the hesychasts uncongenial, even if they might have found his own type of apophaticism somewhat violent? Is not the revival of hesychasm in modern Orthodoxy strikingly paralleled by the revival of contemplative prayer in the West, and may not both be different species of the same generic response to a situation which is common to Christians of both East and West to-day? And may it not be sig-

nificant that both of these revivals have been accompanied by a recovery of the sense of the liturgy and a movement for more frequent communion? These are some of the questions that Dr Meyendorff's book provokes one to ask. I am far from sure that the answers are as simple as one would like them to be, but I am sure that they are worth seeking. And these seem to me to be the kind of questions that dogmatic theologians ought to be investigating.

One final aspect of the importance of Palamas in the present ecumenical setting ought to be stressed. Dr Meyendorff shows clearly how radically *Christian* Gregory's theology and spirituality are, in spite of the neo-Platonist mould in which they are cast, and how sharply in this respect they are contrasted with the Evagrian outlook. That progress in the Christian life is the fruit of the sacrament of baptism and that it takes place within the sacramental life of the Church, that it is the whole man, body and soul together, who is deified by grace, and that this is directly contrary to any purely spiritual or intellectual Plotinian flight of the alone to the alone, such emphases as these in Palamism are surely in tune with the most vigorous insights of contemporary religious thought in the West to-day, and it appears that Eastern Orthodox spirituality had remembered them when the West had largely forgotten them.

Even the Orthodox polemic against the created supernatural seems to me to be fully justified, except that I have never met any Western Catholic who held the point of view against which it is directed; I am not sure that either East or West has managed to produce a satisfactory theory of the way in which a creature, while remaining a creature, can be taken up into the very life of God, but I do not think that there is any serious difference between them about the fact that is to be explained. However, this brings us back again to the question of the relation between the essence-energy duality in Palamism and the essence-existence duality in Thomism, and I do not think it is as academic as it might appear to suggest that a thorough discussion of this question might do more than anything else in the long run to reconcile the theological differences between the Eastern and Western Churches

If this review has consisted largely of unanswered questions, it may perhaps be suggested that a small book which provokes them on such a scale is clearly of more than usual significance. I understand that a much larger book by Dr Meyendorff on Palamas is on the point of publication.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

E. L. Mascall, O.G.S.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Gospels, their Origin and Growth. By F. C. Grant. Faber and Faber. 21s.

Prof. Grant's name was associated at one time with that of the Form critics, who delved into the possibilities of the preliterary

transmission of the Gospels; yet this book is marked by such sanity and learning that he can no longer be regarded as typical of the school that produced Bultmann's "Jesus"; he recognizes the limitations of the Formcritical method (pp. 54 ff.) and can even speak of the Gospels as biographies of Jesus (p. 27); he can accept the existence of Q (p. 60), suggesting that Mark made use of it and that it was a manual of discipleship, rejecting the theory that Luke used Matthew or vice versa (p. 68); and he can take Papias's words on Mark's Gospel seriously (pp. 73 f.) and can call them "admirable"; he does not think Papias stupid, as an ancient writer did, or too clever by half, as a modern one does. He accepts the belief that there is a Petrine element in Mark (pp. 110 ff.) and he does not dismiss out of hand the theory of Proto-Luke (pp. 118 ff.). These instances show how far Prof. Grant is from the recent critics who deny the influence of apostles and eye-witnesses on the evangelists and who construct a theory of the Christian community and its influence on the gospel transmission à la Durkheim's theories of any ordinary community with immanent laws of its own being and growth.

At the same time he is ready to see the controversies of the early Church reflected in the story of Mark (pp. 80 ff.) and he stresses the austerity of this Gospel written for a martyr church.

He dates Luke's Gospel c. 80–5 and Acts c. 95, when Luke would have been "a septuagenarian, at the ripe peak of literary activity for a man who had used notebook and pen all his life". There is no need to date Acts quite so late in the first century, but his treatment of Luke, the Hellenist, rhetorician and historian is excellent, as is also his treatment of Matthew, "the ecclesiastical Gospel", though K. Stendhal's work on the "School of Matthew" seems to have been published after this book went to the press.

There are many shrewd and striking remarks made about the Fourth Gospel, but the level of discussion here is not so high as that of the chapters on the Synoptic Gospels. The book concludes with useful Tables of Outlines of the Gospels, a good bibliography and indices of subjects, persons and texts. The book would be of great value to anyone after his first year's study of theology or to any clerical study-group working on the Gospels in the light of recent criticism and research.

C. S. C. Williams.

Merton College,
Oxford.

No Escape from Love. By Fr Hugh, S.S.F. Faith Press. 1959. 6s.

The Mystery of Suffering. By Hugh Evan Hopkins. Inter-Varsity Fellowship. 1959. 3s. 6d.

Silent Bedes. By S. G. A. Luff. Longmans. 1959. 8s. 6d.

Fr Hugh, S.S.F., has written a deeply penetrating study in forgiveness. This is not another little book about "How to make your confession", and it makes a strong demand upon the reader for close, concentrated attention. There is no need in this review to sum-

marize Fr Hugh's thesis, for the modest price and size of the book (63 pages) put it within the range of the impecunious and the busiest; and neither will think his money or his time wasted. To every thoughtful priest who "hears confessions", and to every thoughtful person (lay or cleric) who uses the sacrament of penance, this profound essay will bring illumination, for the writer has the gift of the great critic of making us understand, and so appreciate, more fully what we already treasure. Those who have had no personal experience of the "divine gift of forgiveness, coming to us through our confession to another and his absolution" need not fear that they are going to be urged to "make their confession". But they will find here a rationale, and also a fascinating historical account, of a thing that so many Christians do and have done, and that this Franciscan writes not to commend a particular religious practice but to share with his reader the Christian's experience of the constraining love of Christ. To conclude with a quotation: "As we kneel we are not simply seeking advice. Our goal . . . is God, and, by our trust in the guide, we are proving that in this divine-human relationship, Christ is the way."

In his foreword to *The Mystery of Suffering* Mr Hopkins writes: "This is by no means a theological treatise. It is simply a modest attempt to look at the chief passages in the Bible which deal with this topic of suffering and pain. . . ." Exactly! This *is* another little book on suffering, and a very excellent one, admirable for lending to individuals or for use in group discussion. It is firmly based on the Bible, and constantly refers to persons, situations and the theology of the Bible. The author writes well, has a happy knack of quotation, and is entirely free from sentimentality. He is particularly good on the subject of those many people who sigh over their sufferings (anything from a painful illness to the annoyance of living with an awkward mother-in-law) and say, "I think this must be my cross", or, "This must be the will of God". Christ spoke of "taking, bearing or taking-up" one's cross (Mr Hopkins provides the scriptural references, as he does throughout the book, but quite rightly does not quote the Greek words, which in this case are *lambanein, bastazein, airein*); and so the Christian's cross is *primarily* a matter of discipline and sacrifice voluntarily (and gladly) undertaken, not of suffering and distress. Again, the will of God is *primarily* something wonderful, to be sought and enjoyed, a positive, inspiring activity; not something to be endured! The author's deep compassion for, and understanding of, those who suffer, serve greatly to enhance the truth of his main theme, viz. that to the Christian, *suffering is not a problem but an opportunity*. "Faith therefore sees in calamity a challenge to our trust rather than a problem to our intellect."

You do not need to posses a rosary to appreciate *Silent Bedes*, a set of "practical meditations" (to quote the sub-title) by a Roman Catholic layman on the joyful, sorrowful and glorious mysteries. They are fresh, intelligent and entirely sensible, as the two following brief examples of Mr Luff's pithy writing show: ". . . it is not alone

carrying the cross which qualifies Christ's disciples. We bear it to die on it, not under it." "Our generous right hands that hasten to flatter a favourite charity must sometimes blush at their partner's sloth in settling small debts." There is an appendix on the historical evolution of the rosary, but this reader wished there had also been some indication of exactly how a rosary is used. Also, the price seems high for so slight a volume.

MICHAEL CAMPLING.

ROEHAMPTON.

THE UNCEASING CONFLICT. By Mabel C. Warburton. N.S. and S.P.C.K. 1959. 6s.

THE MODERNITY OF ST AUGUSTINE. By J. Guitton. Geoffrey Chapman. 1959. 7s. 6d.

Young students and those who wish quickly to acquire an overall picture of the Church's historic conflict with heresy and schism will find in Miss Warburton's book a skilfully compressed review. Her main thesis is that the issues involved in the Church's constant struggle against error and persecution are not purely historical, but urgently relevant. In order to stress this point she interweaves with sketches of Gnosticism, Arianism, Donatism, and other ancient perversions of the gospel, some outlines of modern perversions of truth, briefly considering the whole range of "Christian deviations", theosophy, modern paganism, and the present strength of Islam (the latter a subject about which the writer is particularly well informed). Side by side with her appreciative accounts of St Paul, Athanasius, Polycarp, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, Boniface, and many others of the Church's heroes who "nobly fought of old" to preserve entire the precious jewel of the gospel's truth, she shows how high a quality of heroism is being demanded of would-be contenders for Christian truth to-day. This is a truly admirable book. The scope is wide, the style lucid, the message challenging, and there is no small achievement in revealing, within 123 pages, such an extent of knowledge and such a depth of insight.

At first sight, M. Guitton's work has much in common with Miss Warburton's. Here again we are shown the continual freshness of the first 450 years of the Christian era, both in doctrinal debate and in philosophical thought. But here the field for investigating this freshness is much more limited, this time to one great figure, Augustine himself. We have here the basis of some lectures given by the author at the time of the sixteen-hundredth anniversary of Augustine's birth in 1954, and recently translated. This little book is not for the general reader, but it will be a delight for those who have a nodding acquaintance both with Augustine in particular, and with the history of philosophy in general, for they will be stimulated to see Augustine compared, briefly but tellingly, not only with Plato, but also with "moderns" of such stature and diversity as Freud, Proust, Gide, Sartre, Hegel, and Cardinal Newman. Just as, in modern doctrinal

debate, no question can be raised which Augustine has not already discussed, so in philosophy, Augustine rediscovers the ancients and prefigures the moderns. He is the great "integrator" of all human experience, both individual and corporate, so that it is no surprise to hear that in him "we have Plato rediscovered, Pascal proclaimed and prefigured".

In these two books we are reminded that all the problems, all the conflicts, all the devotional thought, of the first four Christian centuries, are up to date, and that they are by no means yet at an end.

D. H. Sansum.

Bristol.

History of the Mass. By François Amiot. Burns and Oates. 7s. 6d.

Fr Amiot is director of the seminary of St Sulpice, and his *Histoire de la Messe*, of which this is an excellent translation, forms one of an encyclopedic series of "Faith and Fact" books directed at the educated Roman Catholic layman. For a book of 140 pages it contains a great deal, and, while inevitably little discussion of evidence is possible, scholarship is exact and judgment judicious. Most scholars would doubt whether the Sanctus was introduced into the Roman Liturgy as early as is asserted on p. 81, where there seems to be some misprinting of figures. One important and inevitable problem is raised by the juxtaposition of two distinct aims in such a book as this, to provide scholarly history and to explain present Roman Catholic liturgical practice, and a non-Roman may perhaps be allowed to doubt whether it can be solved. The Roman Canon evidently dates from a period before the moment of consecration was limited to the words of Institution: it is one prayer of Offering and it seems to view consecration as implicitly effected by the acceptance of the oblation by God, offered as they are by the Church through, with and in Jesus Christ, according to his example and command. Our Lord's words in most liturgies are recounted in full as our warrant for making the oblation and so naturally assume a pivotal role in the Eucharistic Prayer. Though the author repeatedly insists that no moment of consecration was emphasized in the Canon until the Middle Ages, he nevertheless interprets its text, and the text of other liturgies, on the principle that transubstantiation is effected at the narrative of the Institution, and this leads him into some tortuous argument reminiscent of later medieval reasonings about the theology of the Canon. Is it possible, or necessary, in this as in other fields of study, to read into an early document the theological precision of later times, as Fr Amiot and other Roman Catholic scholars do here? However, though a little more on origins would have been valuable, this book can be recommended as an introductory survey for students of the Roman Liturgy. On p. 107 *illusion* is printed for *allusion*.

Victor de Waal.

King's College,
Cambridge.

THE GOSPEL OF THE INCARNATION. By G. S. Hendry. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 15s.

THE WONDER OF THE CHRISTIAN GOSPEL. By J. M. Shaw. Lutterworth Press. 1959. 12s. 6d.

HEIRS TO RESPONSIBILITY. By A. C. Lamb. Epworth Press. 1959. 10s. 6d.

THE RISEN CHRIST. By Caryll Houselander. Sheed and Ward. 1959. 8s. 6d.

The Gospel of the Incarnation begins with an interesting chapter in which Dr Hendry seeks to show that Christian disunity arises not simply from "different interpretations" put upon "specific matters, such as the institution of the Church, the ministry and the sacraments", but also from the different emphases placed an "the total Gospel of Christ". He would, for instance, trace the misunderstanding between East and West largely to the fact that the East has been more preoccupied with the Incarnation, whilst the West has been more preoccupied with the Atonement; and he stresses—and this is his major thesis—that there is a very great unity between the Incarnation and the Atonement, suggesting that in our Lord's pronouncement from the cross, *Tetelesthai,* it is "the incarnation of the Son of Man (that) is complete". The theme is far from original, and was expressed succinctly long ago in the words of St Paul, "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself"; but Dr Hendry's book does serve to enlarge on this. A second theme of his work stresses the relevance to the "total Gospel of Christ" of the events in the teaching and healing ministry of our Lord. There is an interesting chapter on the Atonement; though it is rather disappointing to find that what promises to be a broad view is confined to a metaphor of conquest. A doctrine of the Atonement which rejects altogether the sacrificial metaphor so strongly voiced in the New Testament seems somewhat lop-sided. The author finds fault with the terms of the Chalcedonian definition, and it is certainly fair to question how far they are comprehensible to-day—though it is surely giving a wrong impression to say that they are upheld by the Church of Rome and "others in the Church of England and elsewhere". The official position of the Church of England is shown by the *Quicumque Vult* to be just as clear as that of the Church of Rome.

Dr Hendry writes from a Protestant viewpoint; and it does seem with regard to the controversial doctrines of the Church and the sacraments in relation to the Incarnation that little constructive is added to the traditional Protestant position, and nothing that would help to lessen the deep divisions of Christians on this issue. Nevertheless, this is a stimulating and provocative contribution to incarnational theology.

The Wonder of the Christian Gospel attempts the difficult task of producing what the author calls "a statement of the substance of the Christian faith of such a character as can be readily understood by the ordinary members of the Church and be realized to be of vital relevance to everyday thought and life". Dr Shaw, like Dr Hendry,

writes as a Protestant, and there are inevitably times when we would disagree with his interpretation of the Gospel; but he succeeds in giving a lucid presentation of his viewpoint.

Two points are especially worthy of note. First, a whole chapter is devoted to sanctification; and starting from the three tenses *sotheis, sozomenos* and *sesozomenos* used by St Paul in 2 Cor. 1. 10, he gives to sanctification a more realistic place in the process of redemption than is common in Protestant theology. He insists that rather than being saved *from sin*, we are saved *to a new state of life*, and he points out that St Paul speaks of salvation not *by* faith, but *by* grace, *through* faith. Secondly, he stresses the intercessory work of the Ascended Christ—though his separation between the sacrificial offering of Calvary and its "intercessory effect" in heaven is unfortunate.

Heirs to Responsibility is based on a series of addresses for Lent. Dr Lamb's purpose is to see the events of the Passion, the Resurrection and Pentecost not so much in the light of what God has done *for* humanity as in the light of what he wills to effect *through* humanity; and he sees in a number of events and stages in the history of the infant Church a progressive preparation of the Apostles for this. Dr Lamb is a Methodist; and his position is quite clear. For instance, he denies any special presence of our Lord in the Eucharist: "There is," he says, "no mysterious 'Communion' with Christ in the Sacrament Service for me apart from this one element of self-offering." In this Dr Lamb stands at the "left-wing" of Protestant tradition—it is usual for some kind of doctrine of a "special presence" to be accepted, even if it is not closely connected with the consecrated Elements—and the writer suggests that this is because "staunch Protestants are often subject to subconscious Catholic influences and vaguely feel that Christ is present in the Lord's Supper in a way that is unique". But the author has a charitable approach, recognizing that "many hold dear" what he feels bound to reject.

Whatever the etymological explanation of the term "Low Sunday", it must be admitted that after Easter Day there is a very common flagging of interest so that Eastertide becomes something of an anticlimax. This is due in large measure to a mistaken piety that has seen the cross in isolation from the resurrection; and *The Risen Christ* is a meditation on the resurrection aiming to redress the balance.

Caryll Houselander is a Roman Catholic, and at times we would not be able to go all the way with her; but this does not apply to her major thesis. She stresses how all-important the resurrection is to the Church, not simply as the vindication of Christ, but as the source of the Church's life. She sees the Risen Christ at work in his Church, dying and rising in individual Christians in every Baptism and every Confession, and indeed in the whole sacramental life of the Church.

This is a very readable little book; and two features are especially pleasing in a Roman Catholic work. In the first place, she does not pretend that the Roman Church has all the answers; and she is

critical of those Roman Catholics who give people the idea that "we are not seeking any more, that we have a formula for everything . . . and that there is nothing that we cannot explain". In the second place, the Eucharist, which is seen as the central activity of the Risen Christ through his Body the Church, is closely linked to everyday life; and the writer seems to stand in the tradition of the Liturgical Movement. Life itself is part of the whole activity of the liturgy, and work, whether it be in the kitchen or the office or the factory, is to be offered as part of the whole offering of Christ.

RONALD S. LUNT.

STOCKPORT,
CHESHIRE.

TO-MORROW IS A HOLIDAY. By E. H. Robertson. S.C.M. Press. 8s. 6d.

Mr Robertson, Study Secretary of the United Bible Societies, visited South America to learn "something of church life" there. He sought contact with many denominations, including the Pentecostals who may well "hold the future of Latin-America in their hands". The Anglican Communion admits that she has neglected this continent, where "vast masses owe no definite allegiance to the Roman Catholic Church" (Lambeth Report, 1958). Mr Robertson, however, ignores both the splendid work of the Anglican S.A.M.S. among the Indians and the rapid growth of the American Episcopal Church in Brazil, and he treats the Roman Catholic Church with contempt. He confesses that the book was written "in the heat of the moment" and "edited as little as possible". The unfortunate result is a rather superficial and distorted picture of the religious life of Latin-America.

FLORENCE N. BOLTON.

KILSCORAN RECTORY,
TAGOAT,
CO. WEXFORD.

PAUVRE ET SAINT CURÉ D'ARS By Daniel Pezeril. Editions du Seuil. 1959. N.p.

This being the centenary year of the death of St John Vianney, we should expect a renewal of interest in the subject, though, in fact, interest in the simple parish priest, who became a saint, has never been lacking. Selections of his sayings or his teaching fall flat. Anecdotes, while entertaining, can be misleading. Themes are more revealing, but do not give the whole picture. We must have the whole life if we are to understand this rare type of sanctity. Hagiography has its place, but where the subject is well documented and known to living people, something more is needed. One writer points out that the curé was a "deserter" from the army, another that he had an excessive Puritan strain in his character. His contemporaries had many things to say against his teaching, his practice and even his clothes. And they were not all his detractors. His superiors did not

always find him a "good subject", and his theology was not entirely orthodox. Hagiography will admit but two points of view, one black the other white; but the author of this excellent book seeks to trace the "spiritual journey" of the curé without passing judgment and without withholding the evidence.

When one reaches the end of the journey, one has a deeper understanding of the saint; and his stature, even in that illustrious company, is greater than at first appeared.

This is not the portrait of a poor and persecuted parish priest who ultimately triumphed in his parish, as we have often been led to suppose. It is the portrait, among others, of a priest, a parish priest par excellence, who had many failures and disappointments (the dances, which he tried so hard to stop, did not cease until 1847, and he always had critics within the parish, to give two instances), some successes (for example, the Jubilee Year, when he felt as though the battle had been won for good); but the end was failure. It is the paradox of the Cross again. Victory comes through failure, or will come. If we were to visit Ars to-day we might conclude that the issue is still a live one.

We are probably still too close to our subject to be able to use all the evidence and see it in the right perspective, but this book makes a valuable contribution and it is much to be hoped that it will find a good translator.

B. M. Oman.

Bute Street,
Cardiff Docks.

Friendship. By Eveline Holmes. S.C.M. Press. 1959. 6s.

Kirkbride and Company. By Harry Blamires. S.P.C.K. 1959. 15s. 6d.

The Christian Family. By Leslie and Winifred Brown. Lutterworth Press. 1959. 2s. 6d.

Kagawa, Japanese Prophet. By Jessie M. Trout. Lutterworth Press. 1959. 2s. 6d.

Just as each new-born infant is a bundle of possibilities, so each and every encounter between two persons is a package of potentialities as well as problems. To be able to write a book about these which is neither pious, platitudinous nor dull, as Miss Holmes certainly has done, is a remarkable achievement. There is much more to friendship than mere meeting of person with person. Only when this meeting is seen within the love of God can we discover the meaning ("It was too hard for me until I went to the altar of God") of friendship at all. Can two people come together in understanding without trespassing on the sovereign separateness of each other? The union with, as well as the distance apart from, should stand out equally in friendship, but how, save in the light of Christ, is the paradox possible? The function of this book is not to give a clear answer to these questions, but to make us see the necessity for asking them. We need to be defended from false conceptions such as that

shallow, back-slapping matiness which has much to do with this world, but little or nothing with the next. While it would be quite easy to make criticisms of various details, to mention certain omissions, and perhaps to make some discount for its being a women's approach (for which, in fact, it is perhaps all the better), it is a good book which takes us over country, as no other book I can think of does, with the firm step of one who knows the difference between emotion and judgment as well as the balance between these in every human friendship.

Fiction as a means of putting across the Christian faith is a particularly difficult and hazardous undertaking. Mr Blamires's intentions are so good that it might be thought charitable to turn a blind eye to this book's lack of illusion and the puppet-like form of its characters. They are too black and white and are not given sufficient background. Thus they can only speak for Mr Blamire rather than instead of him. Aunt Enid comes in—storms in—for no other purpose than for Mr Blamires to make use of her nonsense. If, however, her nonsense could have been polished up—that is, toned down—she might have been more interesting and less impossible. It is unfortunate that *Kirkbride and Company* has to be judged as a work of fiction. If one were able to discuss it as a treatise on modern life, one might find oneself saying that the correlation it assumes between morals and faith was "like a novel". But why? That is interesting.

Drawing on wide experience and differing habits and customs in England, Africa and India, the Bishop of Uganda and his wife attempt to answer the question: What is it that makes the family Christian? That Christ can and does enter into marriage and family relationships and transform them, so that sex can become more than a function of the body, is true. Yet I am not sure whether *The Christian Family* wholly answers the question. Possibly the reason is that, like many other short books on the topic, it is too ready to explain rather than to introduce one to the profound depths of the mysteries of married love.

The interpretation, rather than explanation, of the mysteries not only of sex but of the whole incarnate life of the Christian in this world is the concern of Toyohiko Kagawa. This short book is a brief portrait of him, together with a selection of his writings. Strange as some of this will be to European eyes, much of it has a relevance and a reality for all Christians. Kagawa is clearly one who should be better known.

W. S. Boycott.

Ewen Farm House,
Near Cirencester.

BOOK NOTES

The British and Foreign Bible Society has produced a new edition of the Hebrew Old Testament (17s. 6d.), edited by Dr N. H. Snaith, which is a welcome companion to its new edition of the New Testament in Greek (see Theology, January 1959, pp. 39 f.). *Biblica* (xl, 2, 1959) contains an article by J. L. Mackenzie, S.J., on "The Elders in the Old Testament" (pp. 522–40).

Three papers by Karl Barth have been published as a Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Paper, under the title *God, Grace and the Gospel* (Oliver and Boyd, 8s. 6d.).The first is "Gospel and Law", which was to have been read by him at Barmen in 1935 but had to be read on his behalf as he was at that time deported from Germany. The second is "The Humanity of God", of which an account was given in THEOLOGY, July 1959, pp. 271–4. The third is "Evangelical Theology in the Nineteenth Century", which was delivered as an address in 1957. *The Shorter Knox Bible* (Burns and Oates, and Macmillan, 10s. 6d.) is an abridged version of R. A. Knox's translation of the Old Testament: the editor is Prof. L. Johnston. *A Treasury of Christian Verse*, edited by Hugh Martin (S.C.M. Press, 9s. 6d.), is an attractive selection of English Christian poetry from Cynewulf to John Betjeman. The S.C.M. Press has published a new and complete edition of Dietrich Bonhoeffer's *The Cost of Discipleship* (18s.); the earlier, abridged edition was reviewed in THEOLOGY, May 1949, pp. 194 f. A recent addition to "World Christian Books" is a short commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians by Bishop Stephen Neill: *Paul to the Galatians* (Lutterworth Press, 2s. 6d.). *The Tutorial Prayer Book*, edited by Charles Neil and J. M. Willoughby and first published in 1912, has been out of print since 1950. A new edition (Church Book Room Press, 21s.) has been printed from the plates of the second edition of 1913, together with a short appendix on "Prayer Book Revision" by Dr C. S. Carter, in which the name of William Temple's biographer is twice spelt "Ironmonger". Shortly before his death Dr C. Ryder Smith had completed a volume on *The Bible Doctrine of the Hereafter* (Epworth Press, 30s.), which concludes the useful series of books he wrote on the theological teaching of the Bible. Collins have published *The Mind of St Paul* by Dr William Barclay (16s.); the material originally appeared as a series of articles in *The British Weekly*.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

AMERICAN CHURCH PUBLICATIONS: Robert W. Shoemaker, *The Origin and Meaning of the Name "Protestant Episcopal"* ($3.95).

BLOOMSBURY PUBLISHING CO.: Dom Basil Whelan, O.S.B., *The History of Belmont Abbey* (25s.).

BURNS AND OATES: André Rétif, S.J., *The Catholic Spirit* (7s. 6d.).

CHURCH INFORMATION OFFICE: *Ought Suicide to be a Crime?* (2s. 6d.); Alfred Torrie, *The Middle-Aged Man* (1s. 6d.).

CLARENDON PRESS: Henry Chadwick, *The Circle and the Ellipse* (2s. 6d.).

COLLINS: J. B. Phillips, *The Young Church in Action* [modern English version of the Acts of the Apostles, now available as a Fontana Book] (2s. 6d.).

FABER: William G. Pollard, *Chance and Providence* (16s.).

FAITH PRESS: Mervyn Stockwood, *Cambridge Sermons* (15s. and 8s. 6d.); Dudley Symon, *Roman and Uncondemned?* (12s. 6d.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: E. W. Kemp, *The Life and Letters of Kenneth Escott Kirk* (20s.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: Charles Simeon, *Let Wisdom Judge* (9s. 6d.).

LONGMANS: Nigel Abercrombie, *The Life and Work of Edmund Bishop* (70s.).

MONTH PUBLICATIONS: R. A. Knox, *Proving God: a New Apologetic* (3s.).

MOWBRAY: Einar Molland, *Christendom* (35s.); Lindsay Dewar, *The Holy Spirit and Modern Thought* (25s.).

PENGUIN BOOKS: Eleanor Graham, *The Story of Jesus* (3s. 6d.).

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: Ernest G. Loosley, *The Gospel of St Mark* (5s. and 6s.); Ernest W. Hayes (Ed.), *Over to You!* (7s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: William Telfer, *The Forgiveness of Sins* (12s. 6d.); Alasdair C. MacIntyre, *Difficulties in Christian Belief* (8s. 6d.); John Middleton Murry, *Not as the Scribes* (18s.); Peter Munz, *Problems of Religious Knowledge* (25s.).

SHEED AND WARD: Cecily Hastings, *The Point of Catholicism* (3s. 6d.); Christopher Dawson, *The Movement of World Revolution* (13s. 6d.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON